DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 148 775 SP 012 015

AUTHOR Petruzielo, Frank R.
TITLE Improving Teacher Ability to Cope Effectively with Disruptive Behavior in the Classroom.
PUB DATE Jul 77
NOTE 70p.; Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the National Ed.D. Program for Educational Leaders, Nova University, Fort Lauderdale, Florida

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Problems; *Class Management; *Discipline Problems; *Educational Practice; *Inservice Teacher Education; Socially Deviant Behavior; *Student Behavior
IDENTIFIERS *Disruptive Students

ABSTRACT

This document describes a practicum on the improvement of teacher ability to cope effectively with disruptive behavior and ultimately to reduce incidence of such behavior. Plans for accomplishing these objectives involved: (1) familiarizing participants with current concepts, techniques, and strategies for dealing with disruptive behavior and (2) assisting them in applying these techniques in individual classrooms. Eleven teachers in an urban school were selected to participate in a program of: (1) inservice seminars; (2) work sessions, with guidance counselors, occupational specialists, and other resource persons to identify ways each of these people could assist the teacher in working with disruptive students; and (3) practical application of techniques learned. Analysis of a post-test on teacher knowledge revealed that scores were, on the average, 75 percent higher than pre-test scores; target group members each realized a 65 percent (or higher) reduction in individual rates of disciplinary referrals to the office; and each participant enjoyed a net reduction of at least 60 percent in his previous rate of classroom disruptions. (MJB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

SP

JUL 15 1977

ED148775

IMPROVING TEACHER ABILITY TO COPE EFFECTIVELY WITH DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIOR IN THE CLASSROOM

by

Frank R. Petruzielo

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Suzanne Kelley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the National Ed.D. Program for Educational Leaders, Nova University

Individual Practicum
Miami-Fort Lauderdale Cluster
Submitted: July, 1977

SP012 015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	5
Conceptualizing a Solution	7
Specific Objectives of the Practicum	8
II. PRACTICUM DESIGN	10
Review of the Literature	10
Participant Selection	15
In-Service Seminars (Phase One)	16
Use of Resource Personnel (Phase Two)	21
Classroom Applications (Phase Three)	23
III. EVALUATION	25
Presentation of the Data	25
Analysis of the Data	30
IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	32
GLOSSARY	34
BIBLIOGRAPHY	36
APPENDICES	41
APPENDIX A: Pre- and Post-Survey: Teacher Knowledge of Current Concepts, Strategies, and Skills for Coping with Disruptive Student Behavior	41
APPENDIX B: Classroom Disruption Frequency Chart	43
APPENDIX C: Introductory Sign-up Memorandum to Nautilus Staff	45

PART

Page

APPENDIX D: Calendar of In-Service Seminars 47

APPENDIX E: Letter to Dr. Arthur Coverson, Principal of Youth Opportunity North 51

APPENDIX F: Individual Classroom Disruption Frequency Charts for Each Participant . . . 53

AUG 11 1977

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES		Page
1.	Disruptive Student Behavior in the Dade County Public Schools	3
2.	Nautilus Junior High School Disciplinary Referrals and Assignments to Internal and External Suspension . . .	6
3.	Junior High School Disciplinary Referrals and Assignments to Internal and External Suspension (1975-76)	7
4.	Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Scores . .	26
5.	Comparison of Pre- and Post-Rates of Disciplinary Referrals	27
6.	Comparison of Pre- and Post-Rates of Classroom Disruptions for Target Group Participants	28
7.	Comparison of Pre- and Post-Treatment Classroom Disruptions for Entire Target Group	29

I. INTRODUCTION

In a 1974-75 district-wide assessment directed at Florida's Dade County Public School teaching and administrative staff, the most seriously perceived problem was that of disruptive student behavior. This conclusion has also been reached by other metropolitan school districts and federal agencies and has resulted in congressional hearings, topics of national conventions, and local grand jury investigation. Partially as a result of these phenomena, the Planning and Evaluation Department of the Dade County Public Schools was directed to conduct a general investigation of the problem.

The study that ensued was designed to describe the impact that disruptive behavior and its various manifestations had on students and staff within Dade's public schools. Student questionnaires were sent to 15 randomly selected students in each of Dade's 77 secondary schools and interviews covering the same items were conducted with 52 randomly selected elementary students. Teacher questionnaires were sent to three randomly selected teachers in each of Dade's elementary schools

and five in each of Dade's junior and senior high schools.[1]

Analysis of teacher response on the questionnaire demonstrably showed,

> Junior high school teachers spend more time than elementary or senior high teachers in coping with disruptive behavior. In the case of their "worst" class, 35 percent, as compared with 24% of elementary teachers and 10 percent of senior high school teachers, report expending from 41 percent to 100 percent of their time in coping with in-class disruption.[2]

Indeed, as illustrated in Table 1 below, specific category and mean percents of junior high teachers reporting at least one incident since September, 1975 were significantly greater than those reported by elementary and senior high teachers for the same time period.

The questionnaire also assessed teacher perception of their role (and the role of others--e.g., counselors, assistant principals, etc.) in relation to the problem of disruptive behavior and asked how much course work or orientation teachers had had or desired to have on coping with disruptive students. It should be noted that nearly 75 percent of the junior high teachers responding indicated they had never taken a course or undergone an orientation whose primary purpose was to give them the knowledge and skills necessary for successfully coping

---

[1]Excerpted from "Experience of Teachers and Students with Disruptive Behavior in the Dade Public Schools," Planning and Evaluation Department, Dade County Public Schools (June, 1976), pp. 1-2.

[2]Ibid., p. 3.

TABLE 1

DISRUPTIVE STUDENT BEHAVIOR IN THE

DADE COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

How many times this year have you:	Percents of Teachers Reporting at Least One Incident Since September, 1975		
	ELEMENTARY	JUNIOR	SENIOR
A. had personal items taken from your desk?	46.9	53.2	39.1
B. had your car broken into on school-controlled property?	2.2	5.0	4.1
C. had your car defaced or damaged on school-controlled property?	15.3	29.5	31.1
D. had a student shout, or use abusive language at you?	49.1	77.0	63.5
E. had articles stolen from your purse or school mailbox?	9.7	12.2	9.5
F. been threatened by a student with physical harm?	11.2	39.6	17.6
G. had your instructional process completely disrupted by the behavior of a student?	7.2	12.2	4.1
H. been threatened by a student with sexual abuse?	0.0	1.4	1.4
I. been struck by a student?	7.2	12.2	4.1

TABLE 1 (Continued)

How many times this year have you:	Percents of Teachers Reporting at Least One Incident Since September, 1975		
	ELEMENTARY	JUNIOR	SENIOR
J. been sexually abused by a student?	0.0	0.0	0.0
K. had possessions forcibly taken from your person by a student?	0.0	2.9	0.0
L. been pushed or jostled hard enough in the hallway, or outside school to fall down?	4.7	11.5	1.4
M. had students report to you that they had objects or possessions stolen?	74.7	82.7	71.6
N. had students report to you that they had been physically assaulted?	46.6	54.7	40.5
O. had students report to you that they had been extorted?	12.8	21.1	13.5
P. had students report to you that they had been sexually abused?	2.2	14.4	4.1
MEAN =	21.53	30.63	20.8

with disruptive students; and perhaps more significantly, 58 percent of the junior high teachers responding indicated they would be "very interested" or "moderately interested" in taking such a course or engaging in such an orientation if it were conveniently available.

Statement of the Problem

As a Dade County junior high school Assistant Principal for Administration with major responsibilities in student discipline, the writer examined the above results with more than a little interest. Indeed, completion of the same teacher questionnaire by a dozen randomly selected teachers on our staff indicated that their perceptions of disruptive behavior, their lack of formal training or specific orientation in coping with disruptive students, and their desire to gain the knowledge and skills necessary to cope effectively with such students, closely paralleled the district results mentioned earlier in those areas.

In addition, a tally and analysis of disciplinary referrals to the office, assignments to the school center for special instruction, and external suspensions for last year (1975-76) and the first seven weeks of this year revealed that, indeed, the school had experienced a considerable number of classroom disruptions (see Table 2 below):

TABLE 2

NAUTILUS JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL DISCIPLINARY REFERRALS AND ASSIGNMENTS TO INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL SUSPENSION

	1975-76 (entire year)	1976-77 (1st 7 weeks)
Disciplinary Referrals	1,648	247
Assignments to School Center for Special Instruction (Internal Suspension)	234	78
External Suspensions	44	18

When these data were compared to those of three other Dade County junior high schools in the vicinity with similar enrollments and student populations (see Table 3 below), it was hypothesized that Nautilus had experienced more than its share of disciplinary problems and classroom disruptions.

These factors, together with the fact that the School Board of Dade County had designated improvement of student behavior as its top priority for 1976-77, compelled the writer to focus this practicum on the improvement of teacher ability to cope effectively with disruptive behavior. Ultimately, the practicum was

TABLE 3

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL DISCIPLINARY REFERRALS

AND ASSIGNMENTS TO INTERNAL AND

EXTERNAL SUSPENSION

(1975-76)

	School A	School B	School C	Nautilus
Disciplinary Referrals	1,089	950	1,121	1,648
Assignments to School Center for Special Instruction (Internal Suspension)	172	113	149	234
External Suspensions	24	26	37	44

designed to reduce incidents of such behavior in selected classrooms.

Conceptualizing a Solution

There were a number of ways one might have gone about deciding which teachers on our staff would benefit most from a program planned specifically to improve teacher ability to cope effectively with disruptive behavior. For the purposes of this project, prior classroom observations by administrators in the school, previous rates of student disciplinary referrals to the office, and subject interest were the major factors considered in selection of staff

members to participate in the program.

Essentially, the overall goal of the practicum was to assist selected participants in improving their ability to deal effectively with disruptive students. The plan for accomplishing this involved (1) familiarizing participants with current concepts, techniques, and strategies for dealing with disruptive behavior, and (2) assisting them in applying these techniques in individual classrooms. The program itself was designed as a transportable package of concepts, objectives, activities, and resources that could be used intact or modified and adapted to meet similar needs in other schools or school districts.

Specific Objectives of the Practicum

The specific objectives of the practicum were as follows:

1. As measured through pre- and post-testing with an instrument designed to assess one's knowledge of techniques and skills for coping with disruptive behavior, each participant will show significant gains in knowledge of such techniques and skills. For the purposes of this program, a post-test score at least 25% higher than the pre-test score will constitute a significant gain.
2. The rate of disruptions in each participant's

classroom, as recorded on an original "Classroom Disruption Frequency Chart" by another administrator in the school, will be at least 25% lower at the conclusion of the program than at its outset.

3. The previous rate of disciplinary referrals made to the office will be reduced by at least 50% for each participant.

II. PRACTICUM DESIGN

Fundamental to the success of the program were two preliminary requisities: first, a commitment of support from the Principal; and second, extensive research of the literature related to the problem. The former was secured with relative ease; the latter,needless to say, took much more time and effort.

Review of the Literature

The literature is replete with books and articles related to the topic addressed in this practicum. In an effort to delimit the scope of research and, at the same time, to maintain the intent of stressing current concepts, techniques, and strategies for dealing with disruptive behavior, the writer confined the majority of his review of the literature to books published within the last ten years and periodicals within the last five. Major topics researched included behavior, behavior modification, classroom management, contingency management, and discipline.

Clearly, one of the most useful (and practical) books available on methods for dealing effectively with student behavior problems is Rudolf Dreikurs' Psychology in the Classroom. It not only discusses the theoretical premises

for application of a psychological approach in the classroom, but also examines everyday classroom problems and presents correct and incorrect attempts to solve them.[3] A more recent (1968) book by Dreikurs and Loren Grey, A New Approach to Discipline: Logical Consequences, is also grounded in the philosophy of democratic dealings with children (and students) and the socio-teleological approach of Adlerian psychology. According to Dreikurs,

> The traditional methods of raising children are obsolete; they do not bring the desired result in a democratic setting. Essentially, the aim of this new tradition is to help the parent and the teacher to learn to cope with today's children on the basis of equality and mutual respect.[4]

Don Dinkmeyer, President of the Communication and Motivation Training Institute in Coral Springs (Florida), and also a proponent of "logical consequences," suggests five steps for teachers to take when misbehavior occurs: (1) try to grasp the meaning of the student's behavior, (2) pinpoint the real issue, (3) involve the student in considering alternatives, (4) get a commitment to a specific course of action, and (5) do not punish; let the student learn from experience.[5]

---

[3]Rudolph Dreikurs, M.D., Psychology in the Classroom (New York: Harper & Row, 1968).

[4]Rudolph Dreikurs, M.D. and Loren Grey, A New Approach to Discipline: Logical Consequences (New York: Hawthorne Books, Inc., 1968), p. 20.

[5]Don Dinkmeyer, "Logical Consequences: a Key to Reduction of Disciplinary Problems," Phi Delta Kappan (June, 1976), p. 666.

Henry W. Terrell, writing in the NASSP Bulletin, also recognizes the importance of giving students choices and further points out the effectiveness of classroom routines, rapport, individual conferences, and conferences with parents in dealing with student misbehavior.[6] In an article on racial conflicts in the classroom, Marjorie Curet contends, "The most effective discipline is that which helps students regulate themselves."[7] Particularly in dealing with minority children, she says, teachers must understand that,

> . . . leniency out of fear or imposition of strict discipline because of hostility destroys the students' respect for the teacher and makes maintaining classroom order almost an impossibility.[8]

Another reason some teachers have difficulty dealing with students is that their responses to them communicate non-acceptance. Indeed, Dr. Thomas Gordon, author and high priest of Teacher Effectiveness Training, has analyzed typical teacher responses to students' messages and explains how they often serve as roadblocks to communication. In effect, he argues that teachers must do less ordering, warning, moralizing, advising, judging, name-calling, and the like if they are to communicate effectively

---

[6]Henry W. Terrell, "School Discipline: A Cooperative Approach," NASSP Bulletin LX (February, 1976), 9-14.

[7]Marjorie Curet, "Lessening Racial Conflicts in the Classroom," NASSP Bulletin LX (February, 1976), 38-43.

[8]Ibid., p. 40.

with their students. The alternative categories of response, he suggests, are silence, simple acknowledgement, door openers, and active listening--a process that helps students free themselves of troublesome feelings by encouraging the free expression of those feelings.[9]

An additional theory of practical use to classroom teachers in the public schools is the strategy most commonly known as behavior modification. According to Paul S. George, "Another term for the same process, contingency management, has somewhat less objectionable connotations and seems to be gaining wider usage."[10] At any rate, George suggests four strategies that interested teachers can employ in keeping with B. F. Skinner's technology: (1) remember the law of association, (2) act in light of the law of operant conditioning, (3) learn how to shape student behavior, and (4) cling to positive reinforcement.[11]

A programmed text by Lloyd Homme entitled How to Use Contingency Contracting in the Classroom is also a helpful resource for those interested in this theory.[12]

---

[9]Thomas Gordon, Teacher Effectiveness Training (New York: Peter Wyden, 1972).

[10]Paul S. George, "Good Discipline Through Contingency Management," Clearing House XLVIII (November, 1973), 145-49.

[11]Ibid., pp. 146-47.

[12]Lloyd Homme, How to Use Contingency Contracting in the Classroom (Champaign, Illinois: Research Press, 1970).

The notion of positive reinforcement, interestingly enough, is usually considered antithetical to the traditional idea of punishment as the most common consequence of student misbehavior. In Toward Positive Classroom Discipline, Harvey Clarizio concludes,

> Competent teachers will use rewards more often than punitive measures in managing student behavior. For every punishing experience, there should be approximately four rewarding encounters. Yet even the best of teachers will have to use aversive strategies to produce acceptable behavior.[13]

Indeed, Clarizio's "learning theory approach" spells out the procedure a teacher might use to deal with the troublesome student. Briefly, he must observe to find out what specific behavior he wants to focus on (phase 1). Once these target behaviors have been chosen, ways must be planned to weaken undesirable behaviors (phase 2); and plans must be made to strengthen desirable behaviors (phase 3).[14]

Perhaps the most thought-provoking article was a piece by Walter Doyle entitled "Helping Beginning Teachers Manage Classrooms." Aware of Jacob S. Kounin's findings that what a teacher does before misbehavior takes place is crucial in determining overall disciplinary success, Doyle recounts and amplifies the four dimensions of managerial skill that Kounin cited as key elements in preventing

---

[13] Harvey Clarizio, Toward Positive Classroom Discipline (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1971), p. 125.

[14] Ibid., pp. 9-10.

disruptions and sustaining task involvement. They are: (1) with-itness--the teacher's ability to communicate to students his awareness of what is happening in the classroom; (2) overlap--the teacher's ability to perform two or more activities at one time; (3) movement management--the teacher's skill in maintaining momentum and smoothness, in keeping things going in the classroom; and (4) group focus--the teacher's competence in involving all class members in each classroom event.[15]

In summary, review of the current literature on dealing with disruptive behavior in the classroom revealed that educational theories abound. Among the most prominent are the psychological approach, the use of logical consequences, behavior modification (also called contingency management), and active listening. It is clear that each of these approaches has something valuable to offer those in search of new answers to old problems.

Participant Selection

After a thorough review of relevant research, major concepts to be treated were identified, specific objectives formulated, and related activities planned. Concurrently, 11 teachers on the staff were selected to participate in

---

[15]W. Doyle, "Helping Beginning Teachers Manage Classrooms," NASSP Bulletin (December, 1975), pp. 39-40.

the program and arrangements were made through the Principal for released time and substitute class coverage.

Pre-tests on knowledge of current techniques and strategies for coping effectively with disruptive behavior were developed and administered to each of the 11 participants;[16] selected classes of each were observed by the Assistant Principal for Curriculum who determined current rates of disruptions via an original classroom disruption frequency chart;[17] and previous rates of disciplinary referrals to the office were reviewed and recorded for each of the 11 participants.

In-Service Seminars (Phase One)

In order to derive maximum benefit from the program, all members of the staff were invited to participate in the first phase of the treatment: a series of in-school seminars, chaired by the writer, on the issue of coping with disruptive behavior in the classroom.[18] It was felt that allowing staff members other than just the 11 selected participants to attend the seminar phase of the program would result in a few good disciplinarians participating in those sessions and making comments and suggestions that would be helpful to all.

---

[16]See Appendix A for "Pre-Post-Survey."

[17]See Appendix B for "Classroom Disruption Frequency Chart."

[18]See Appendix C for introductory sign-up memorandum to Nautilus staff.

The major function of each seminar was to present and discuss classroom teaching implications of one or two major concepts that had been discussed in the literature. In order to meet the demand (29 teachers indicated a desire to participate in the planned seminars), it was necessary to schedule two sessions of each seminar. A schedule of group meetings was developed; specific topics were decided upon; and relevant articles from the literature were duplicated and distributed to participants at least one week prior to each session.[19] This enabled each teacher to read and digest the applicable article(s) ahead of time, in order that seminar time could be spent solely on planned activities and discussion.

Initially, in order to make the seminars convenient and attractive to the staff, it was decided that the sessions would be limited to one-half hour. Invariably, however, the writer and participants themselves felt the need to spend more than the scheduled time. In actuality, each session lasted an hour or more, and an administrator planning to conduct such seminars in his school would be well advised to allot at least that amount of time for each session.

In addition, the writer found it effective to vary the approach used in the seminars. In some cases, a lecture format was employed. For example, in the meeting designed to

---

[19]See Appendix D for "Calendar of Seminars."

provide participants with an overview of current methods for dealing with disruptive behavior in the classroom, the writer discussed the results of a Dade County survey on disruptive behavior in the schools; amplified the major issues raised by Ainsworth, Stapleton, and Terrell in their articles on the subject; and offered personal perceptions of how these problems and methods related specifically to Nautilus Junior High School.

In other cases, structured activities were used as a basis for exploration, discovery, and discussion. For example, in the session entitled "The Dirty Dozen: Roadblocks to Communication," each participant was given an exercise that required him to examine a typical student message (e.g., "I think kids should be allowed to leave the school campus for lunch. It's not fair to make us eat in the cafeteria. Anyway, the food there is lousy!"). Then, each participant was instructed to select one of several possible teacher responses (e.g., "The cafeteria food isn't that bad," or, "Gee that's interesting, Why don't you tell me more about it?"). Ultimately, the various teacher responses were keyed into the 15 types of verbal responses suggested by Thomas Gordon in his theory of active listening.

In still other cases, the session was designed to allow and encourage maximum participation and interaction.

For example, in the seminar on punishment, participants were divided into subgroups and each group was charged with the task of developing a model school policy statement on punishment.

In effect, the required readings provided seminar participants with a base of information that enabled them to look intelligently at specific dimensions of the problem of disruptive student behavior and possible methods for dealing with it. The seminars themselves were designed to encourage personal and group efforts to deal with problems that teachers had experienced in their individual classrooms and throughout the building. Since the topics discussed were of major concern to the participants, a great deal of interest and enthusiasm pervaded the sessions and, often, discussions were quite heated.

As a culminating activity, the Principal, Assistant Principal, and Head Counselor of Youth Opportunity North (a local alternative school facility to which continually disruptive students throughout Dade County are referred) agreed to spend a workday morning with program participants discussing some of the proven, successful techniques they had developed for dealing with disruptive students.[20]

The visiting panel first presented a general overview of their program and discussed the major problems and

---

[20]See Appendix E for letter to Dr. Arthur Coverson, Principal of Youth Opportunity North.

characteristics of the children they typically serve. They spoke briefly about the established procedures for referring children to the Youth Opportunity North facility and then spent a considerable amount of time discussing some of their most effective strategies for dealing with disruptive students.

Three particular ideas or techniques that were discussed aroused a great deal of interest in the audience: the "Adopt A Kid" program; the daily progress report form; and the "Call A Parent" program. The idea of the "Adopt A Kid" program is that each staff member becomes a personal counselor, advisor, and advocate of one particularly disruptive child. In effect, he "adopts" the student and makes a special effort to help him adjust both at home and at school. Several teachers suggested that this technique could certainly be implemented at Nautilus and some agreed to participate as "foster parents."

The use of a daily progress report form for particularly disruptive students was also discussed, and, subsequently, a comprehensive commercially available form was ordered for use at Nautilus. The "Call A Parent" program was also interesting. According to this plan, the parent(s) of disruptive students are called by a teacher or the Assistant Principal at the end of each school week, and the child's behavior for that week is discussed. It

was noted that such telephone calls may be negative (if the student has been misbehaving), or positive (if his behavior has improved). All in all, the seminar participants found this final session to be particularly interesting and several of the techniques discussed have already been implemented in individual classrooms and throughout the building.

Use of Resource Personnel (Phase Two)

The second phase of the program focused on the use of school resource personnel. Each of the eleven participants in the target group was scheduled to meet with the school guidance counselors, occupational specialist, center-for-special-instruction teacher, substance abuse specialist, and work-experience coordinator to explore, identify, and/or review ways in which each of these resource persons could assist them in working with disruptive students.[21]

In some cases, sub-groups met with the appropriate grade level counselor to discuss common problems and share suggestions for dealing with particularly disruptive students. In other cases, the occupational specialist, center for special instruction teacher, substance abuse specialist, and work experience coordinator worked with individual

---

[21]See GLOSSARY for role descriptions of resource personnel.

participants during their daily planning periods.

Each resource person was instructed to define his role in the school and to point out clearly how he could assist participants in dealing with disruptive students. The center for special instruction teacher, for example, explained some of the procedures he had used effectively in working with students on internal suspension in the center. In addition, he offered suggestions to each participant on improving his/her classroom management skills (e.g., he recommended and demonstrated the use of seating charts, classroom monitors, attractive bulletin boards, reward systems for good behavior and scholarship, differentiated activities and assignments, careful planning and preparation, and the like).

The occupational specialist and work-experience coordinator actually assisted each participant in classroom planning and instruction by: (1) scheduling field trips for students who had signed and honored behavioral contingency contracts; (2) ordering and showing applicable films and filmstrips; (3) making classroom presentations on various employability skills; and (4) arranging for career resource persons to serve as guest speakers in selected classes of participants.

Finally, the substance abuse specialist, who

regularly organizes and supervises value clarification and peer counseling activities for children with school and/or home problems, agreed to schedule the most disruptive students in each participant's class into weekly rap sessions. The results of these efforts by school-based resource personnel were numerous: (1) target group participants each developed a better understanding of the resource persons' respective contributions to the school; (2) they tended to refer more children having problems in their classrooms to the various resource persons; and (3) they began to utilize these services in both reactive and preventative ways.

Classroom Applications (Phase Three)

The final phase of the program--putting new knowledge and skills to work--required each of the 11 participants in the traget group to: (1) select one of the strategies for dealing with disruptive behavior that had been discussed in the in-service seminars; and (2) demonstrate for at least two of the four administrators in the school that he could use the technique effectively in the classroom.

In order to achieve this, Assistant Principals worked with each participant on the strategy of his choice for several planning periods. In one case, for example, a participant had decided to select the active

listening technique. It was arranged that this teacher had the opportunity to sit in on several conferences in the writer's office while he demonstrated the strategy of active listening in dealing with students who had been referred to the office for disciplinary reasons.

Another participant selected contingency management as an area of concentration. Since a learning disabilities teacher on the staff had been using this technique quite effectively for some time, the participant elected to observe that teacher's class on two occasions and to discuss the use of this strategy with him at length.

The Assistant Principal for Curriculum assisted another participant in implementing a logical consequences approach to classroom management and discipline. After discussing the use of this approach during the teacher's planning period, the Assistant Principal agreed to demonstrate the strategy while teaching one of the teacher's classes for two consecutive days.

Ultimately, after each member of the target group felt confident about his ability to use a selected technique in dealing with disruptive behavior in the classroom, each demonstrated his proficiency in an actual classroom situation.

III. EVALUATION

Eleven teachers on the Nautilus staff were selected to participate in all three phases of the program (in-service seminars; meetings with resource personnel; and classroom applications). Eight of these teachers had accounted for 334 disciplinary referrals to the office during the previous school year (1975-76), and each of the eight had been identified by Assistant Principals and the Principal as having classrooms characterized by inordinate numbers of disruptions. The other three persons encouraged to participate were relatively inexperienced instructors in their first year(s) of teaching at Nautilus.

Presentation of the Data

Although only 11 teachers constituted the target group and were exposed to all three phases of the treatment, a total of 28 staff members signed up for and attended the planned in-service seminars (phase one). As a result, it was decided that pre- and post-test scores on teacher knowledge of current concepts, strategies, and skills for coping with disruptive student behavior would be recorded for all 28 teachers participating in the planned seminars and presented in Table 4 shown below.

TABLE 4

PRE- AND POST-TEST COMPARISON OF TEST SCORES

TARGET GROUP PARTICIPANTS	TEST SCORES		
	Pre-	Post-	Percent Diff.
1.	16	100	+84
2.	24	100	+76
3.	20	91	+71
4.	8	100	+92
5.	8	88	+80
6.	16	95	+79
7.	20	100	+80
8.	4	82	+78
9. (a)	48	100	+52
10. (a)	16	90	+74
11. (a)	34	100	+66
OTHER STAFF MEMBERS			
12.	4	100	+96
13.	26	90	+64
14.	32	90	+58
15.	16	96	+80
16.	16	95	+79
17.	16	100	+84
18.	78	96	+18
19.	20	100	+80
20.	4	100	+96
21.	12	80	+68
22.	16	100	+84
23.	12	100	+88
24.	36	91	+55
25.	20	100	+80
26.	8	95	+87
27.	8	100	+92
28.	20	91	+71

(a) These participants were new teachers for 1976-77.

In Table 5 below, the pre- and post- rates of disciplinary referrals to the office for each of the 11 participants are compared. It should be noted that the usual procedures and criteria for making disciplinary referrals to the office were not changed as a result of this program.

TABLE 5

COMPARISON OF PRE- AND POST- RATES

OF DISCIPLINARY REFERRALS

Target Group Participants	75-76	76-77	Diff.
1.	53	18	-35
2.	46	16	-30
3.	54	20	-34
4.	39	15	-24
5.	28	3	-25
6.	49	5	-44
7.	36	11	-25
8.	29	6	-23
9.	N/A	N/A	N/A
10.	N/A	N/A	N/A
11.	N/A	N/A	N/A
Totals	334	94	-240

Pre- and post-rates of classroom disruptions for each participant and for the entire target group are indicated in Tables 6 and 7 below.[22] It should also be mentioned that the Assistant Principal for Curriculum, who regularly visits classrooms and works with teachers on improving instruction, charted pre- and post rates of disruptions in specific classrooms. In each case, he made two pre- and two post- observations of the same class. Numbers of disruptions recorded represent averages for pre- and post- visits.

TABLE 6

COMPARISON OF PRE- AND POST-RATES OF CLASSROOM DISRUPTIONS FOR TARGET GROUP PARTICIPANTS

Target Group Participants	Pre-	Post-	Diff.
1.	73	12	-61
2.	98	16	-82
3.	140	44	-96
4.	71	24	-47
5.	39	12	-27
6.	53	12	-41
7.	76	22	-54
8.	69	21	-48
9.	128	47	-81
10.	40	14	-26
11.	49	14	-35
Totals	844	247	-597

[22] Individual "Classroom Disruption Frequency Charts" for each of the participants are included in Appendix F.

TABLE 7

COMPARISON OF PRE- AND POST- TREATMENT CLASSROOM DISRUPTIONS FOR ENTIRE TARGET GROUP

STUDENT MISBEHAVIOR	PRE-TREATMENT FREQUENCY	POST-TREATMENT FREQUENCY	DIFFERENCE
ARRIVING LATE	43	17	-26
FAILING TO BRING HOMEWORK	31	13	-18
FAILING TO BRING BOOKS, PAPER, ETC.	29	10	-19
TALKING WITHOUT PERMISSION	139	43	-96
NOT PAYING ATTENTION	105	32	-73
NOT WORKING ON ASSIGNMENTS	67	20	-47
SQUIRMING, FIDGETING	123	40	-83
GETTING OUT OF SEAT WITHOUT PERMISSION	38	7	-31
MAKING LOUD NOISE, LAUGHING	82	26	-56
INTERFERING WITH WORK OF OTHERS	39	12	-27
HINDERING GROUP ACTIVITIES	20	2	-18
SULKING	6	3	- 3
DESTROYING OWN, OTHER'S, OR SCHOOL PROPERTY	3	0	- 3
STEALING	0	0	0
BLAMING OTHERS: NOT ASSUMING RESPONSIBILITY	28	7	-21
USING FOUL OR ABUSIVE LANGUAGE	0	0	0
MAKING OBSCENE GESTURES	0	0	0
THREATENING OTHER STUDENTS	0	0	0
HITTING, FIGHTING WITH OTHER STUDENTS	0	0	0
IGNORING TEACHER	36	11	-35
RESPONDING DISRESPECTFULLY TO TEACHER	21	2	-19
REFUSING TO COMPLY WITH TEACHER DEMANDS	0	0	0
LYING TO TEACHER	24	2	-22
THREATENING, HITTING TEACHER	0	0	0
	844	247	-597
	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL

Analysis of the Data

Table 4 shows that post-test scores on teacher knowledge of current concepts and skills for coping with disruptive student behavior were, on the average, 75 percent higher than pre-test scores. Indeed, each seminar participant demonstrated not only a significant gain on his test score, but actual cognitive mastery of the material covered.

It can be determined from Table 5 that each target group participant significantly reduced his rate of disciplinary referrals to the office. Indeed, each of the 11 participants realized a 65 percent (or higher) reduction in individual rates of referral, and the overall number of referrals by all target group participants decreased from a total of 334 last year to 94 for the current year.

There are, of course, a number of factors that one must consider in analyzing this marked decrease in the number of disciplinary referrals to the office. It should be noted, for example, that participants were aware of the fact that they were being observed and rated on their ability to handle discipline problems. In addition, as a direct result of the program, participants tended to refer far more youngsters to resource personnel after they became aware of how these persons could help them. One should also take into account the

possible Hawthorne effects that participating in a special project may have had on the selected teachers and on their desire to develop strategies for handling their discipline problems themselves.

Tables 6 and 7 reveal that the rate of disruptions in each of the 11 participants' classrooms was significantly lower at the conclusion of the program than it had been at its outset. Indeed, each member of the target group realized a net reduction of at least 60 percent in his previous rate of classroom disruptions, and the group's total number of classroom disruptions decreased from the pre- treatment high of 844 to the post- treatment low of 247--an overall reduction of more than 70 percent.

IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The intent of this practicum was to improve teacher ability to cope effectively with disruptive behavior in the classroom. Through (1) chairing a series of comprehensive seminars designed to acquaint participants with current concepts, strategies, and skills for coping with disruptive behavior, (2) utilizing existing school resource personnel to work with each participant, and (3) actually assisting each participant in applying newly-learned techniques in individual classrooms, the writer feels he has accomplished this goal.

Post-test results indicate that each program participant mastered the material presented in the seminars. Pre- and post-analysis of disciplinary referrals to the office by the participants showed significant reductions for each. Finally, the rate of classroom disruptions for each participant was significantly lower during post-treatment observations than it had been during pre-treatment observations.

The program itself has been presented to the North-east Area Superintendent of the Dade County Public Schools, and he has decided to incorporate a summary of the plan in an official publication on discipline required each year

by the General Superintendent of Schools and the Dade County School Board. To encourage replication, this publication will be distributed to every school in the district and copies will be mailed to other major school systems throughout the country.

GLOSSARY

GUIDANCE COUNSELOR: A full-time professional staff member, certified by the State of Florida, Department of Education, in secondary school guidance and counseling; major areas of concern and responsibility include:
(a) various individual and group counseling services;
(b) cumulative guidance record-keeping;
(c) educational/personal/occupational information;
(d) follow-up and research.

OCCUPATIONAL SPECIALIST: A full-time professional staff member involved in the following activities:
(a) disseminating occupational information to students;
(b) assisting teachers in providing occupational information to students in their classes;
(c) organizing "vocational fairs" in which representatives of various occupations present relevant data and information to interested students.

SCHOOL-CENTER-FOR-SPECIAL-INSTRUCTION TEACHER: A full-time professional staff member, assisted by a full-time clerical aide; major duties and responsibilities include:
(a) supervising students who are placed on internal suspension in the "center" by the assistant principal;
(b) maintaining communication with parents of students assigned to the "center";
(c) counseling students assigned to the "center"; regarding their behavior and assisting them in working their way back into the regular classroom.

SUBSTANCE ABUSE SPECIALIST: A full-time professional staff member with specific responsibilities for:
(a) assisting classroom teachers and administrators in providing programs relative to abuse of various "substance" (e.g. alcohol, drugs, etc.);
(b) organizing, implementing, and monitoring the school's peer counseling program;
(c) counseling individual and small groups of students on matters of personal and general concern.

WORK-EXPERIENCE COORDINATOR: A full-time professional staff member who:

(a) teaches three class sections of "Employability Skills";
(b) assists interested students in securing jobs in the community;
(c) supervises participating students in school and on the job.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Clarizio, Harvey. Toward Positive Classroom Discipline. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1971.

Dreikurs, Rudolf, M.D. Psychology in the Classroom. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

Dreikurs, Rudolf, M.D. and Grey, Loren. A New Approach to Discipline: Logical Consequences. New York: Hawthorne Books, Inc., 1968.

Gordon, Thomas. Teacher Effectiveness Training. New York: Peter Syden, 1972.

Homme, Lloyd. How To Use Contingency Contracting in the Classroom. Champaign, Ill.: Research Press, 1970 (Programmed text).

Kounin, Jacob. Discipline and Group Management in Classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970.

Periodicals

Ainsworth, L and Stapleton, J. C. "Discipline at the Junior High School Level," NASSP Bulletin 60:54-9 (February, 1976).

Banville, T. "23 Ways To Modify Behavior," Instructor 84:94-5 (November, 1974).

Borg, W. R. and others. "Teacher Classroom Management Skills and Pupil Behavior; Utah State University Classroom Management Protocol Modules," The Journal of Experimental Education 44:52-8 (Winter, 1975).

Curet, M. "Lessening Racial Conflicts in the Classroom," NASSP Bulletin 60:38-43 (February, 1976).

Doyle, W. "Helping Beginning Teachers Manage Classrooms," NASSP Bulletin 59:38-41 (December, 1975).

Dunaway, J. "How To Cut Discipline Problems in Half," Today's Education 63:75-7 (January, 1974).

Evans, W. R. "Behavior Problem Checklist: Data from an Inner City Population," Psychology in the Schools 12:301-03 (July, 1975).

Fagen, S. A. and Long, B. J. "Before It Happens: Prevent Discipline Problems by Teaching Self-Control," Instructor 85:42-7 (January, 1976.

Flynn, T. M. "Quantifying Teachers' Recall of Student Behavior; School Adjustment Scale," Psychology in the Schools 11:408-11 (October, 1974).

Forness, S. R. and Esveldt, K. C. "Classroom Observation of Children with Learning and Behavior Problems," Journal of Learning Disabilities 8:382-85 (June, 1975).

Frey, S. H. "Teachers and Behavior Modification," Phi Delta Kappan 55:634-35 (May, 1974).

George, P. S. "Good Discipline Through Contingency Management," Clearing House 48:145-49 (November, 1973).

George, R. L. "Behavior Contract: A Tool for Teachers." Education 94:82-4 (September, 1973).

Gifford, R. "Environmental Numbness in the Classroom," The Journal of Experimental Education 44:4-7 (Spring, 1976).

Goodman, C. and Pendergrass, R. A. "Competence in the Management of Classroom Behavior: An Eclectic Approach," Education 96:297-301 (Spring, 1976).

Grantham, M. L. and Harris, C. S., Jr. "Faculty Trains Itself To Improve Student Discipline," Phi Delta Kappan 57:661-64 (June, 1976).

Hackney, H. "Applying Behavior Contracts to Chronic Problems," The School Counselor 22:23-30 (September, 1974).

Hartman, C. L. "Learning To Describe Behavior," Teacher. 93:42 (December, 1975).

Havis, A. L. "Alternatives for Breaking the Discipline Barrier in Our Schools," Education Digest 41:42-44 (March, 1976).

Hundert, J. and others. "Increasing Appropriate Classroom Behavior and Academic Performance by Reinforcing Correct Work Alone," Psychology in the Schools 13:195-200 (April, 1976).

Jensen, R. E. "Cooperative Relations Between Secondary Teachers and Students: Some Behavioral Strategies," Adolescence 10:469:82 (Winter, 1975).

Kohl, H. "Fighting Back," Teacher 92:6-7 (December, 1974).

_____. "Developing Some Control," Teacher 93:10-11 (December, 1975).

McLaughlin, T. F. "Self-Control Procedures in the Management of Classroom Behavior Problems," Education 96:379-83 (Summer, 1976).

Moskowitz, G. and Hayman, J. L., Jr. "Success Strategies of Inner-City Teachers: A Year-Long Study," The Journal of Educational Research 69:283-89 (April, 1976).

Parks, L. "You Can Teach Self-Direction: Children Evaluate and Reward Themselves," Instructor 84:162 (August, 1974).

Parsons, W. S. and others. "Practical Observation Procedures for Monitoring Four Behaviors Relevant to Classroom Management," Psychology in the Schools 13:64-71 (January, 1976).

Pesner, S. "Education of the Disruptive Non-Learner: A New Concept," The Clearing House 49:413-15 (May, 1976).

Pratt, T. M. "Positive Approach to Disruptive Behavior," Today's Education 64:60-2 (March, 1975).

Rowe, W. and others. "Behavioral Program for Problem Students," The Personnel and Guidance Journal 52:609-12 (May, 1974).

Shook, J. "Alternatives for Management of Disruptive Classroom Behaviors," School and Community 61:28-9 (May, 1975).

Spivack, G. and Swift, M. "Classroom Behavior of Children: A Critical Review of Teacher-Administered Rating Scales," Journal of Special Education 7:55-89 (Spring, 1973).

Stumphauzer, J. S. "Modifying Delinquent Behavior: Beginnings and Current Practices," Adolescence 11:13-28 (Spring, 1976).

Terrell, H. W. "School Discipline: A Cooperative Approach," NASSP Bulletin 60:9-14 (February, 1976).

Warsaw, M. "Behavior Modification in Secondary Schools," Educational Technology 15:21-5 (August, 1975).

Wiedman, R. W, II. and Wiedman, R. W. "Generalization of Behavior Modification Procedures: A Review with Special Emphasis on Classroom Applications," Psychology in the Schools 12:432-48 (October, 1975).

Yoakley, D. H. "Study of Student Participation in Classroom Management To Effect an Increase in Appropriate Behavior," The Journal of Educational Research 69:31-5 (September, 1975).

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

PRE- AND POST-SURVEY: TEACHER KNOWLEDGE OF CURRENT CONCEPTS, STRATEGIES, AND SKILLS FOR COPING WITH DISRUPTIVE STUDENT BEHAVIOR

PRE- AND POST-SURVEY:

Teacher Knowledge of Current Concepts, Strategies, and Skills for Coping with Disruptive Student Behavior.

1. List at least three (3) specific strategies used by teachers who employ behavior modification techniques in the classroom.

   a. (4 pts.)

   b. (4 pts.)

   c. (4 pts.)

2. Suggest at least three (3) rewards which junior high school teachers can use to motivate "problem students."

   a. (4 pts.)

   b. (4 pts.)

   c. (4 pts.)

3. Name at least five (5) ways in which teachers create roadblocks to communication with students.

   a. (4 pts.)

   b. (4 pts.)

   c. (4 pts.)

   d. (4 pts.)

   e. (4 pts.)

4. How can teachers utilize the discipline theory of logical consequences to develop student self-discipline?

   (10 pts.) _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

5. List at least three (3) "pros" and three (3) "cons" of the use of punishment as a disciplinary strategy:

   Pros

   a. (4 pts.)

   b. (4 pts.)

   c. (4 pts.)

   Cons

   a. (4 pts.)

   b. (4 pts.)

   c. (4 pts.)

6. After more than a decade of systematic research, Jacob S. Kounin, in his Discipline and Group Management in Classrooms, was able to identify four dimensions of classroom managerial skills: with-itness, overlap, movement management, and group focus. Briefly explain at least three (3) of these.

   a. (4 pts.)

   b. (4 pts.)

   c. (4 pts.)

7. Thomas Gordon, in his concept and program of Teacher Effectiveness Training (TET), has advanced the theory of active listening. Briefly explain how this technique can help teachers to deal more effectively with disruptive students.

   (10 pts.) _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

TOTAL (100 pts.)

APPENDIX B

CLASSROOM DISRUPTION FREQUENCY CHART

CLASSROOM DISRUPTION FREQUENCY CHART

Teacher _____ Subject _____ Period _____

STUDENT MISBEHAVIOR	Date: PRE-TREATMENT FREQUENCY	Date: POST-TREATMENT FREQUENCY	DIFFERENCE
ARRIVING LATE			
FAILING TO BRING HOMEWORK			
FAILING TO BRING BOOKS, PAPER, ETC.			
TALKING WITHOUT PERMISSION			
NOT PAYING ATTENTION			
NOT WORKING ON ASSIGNMENTS			
SQUIRMING, FIDGETING			
GETTING OUT OF SEAT WITHOUT PERMISSION			
MAKING LOUD NOISE, LAUGHING			
INTERFERING WITH WORK OF OTHERS			
HINDERING GROUP ACTIVITIES			
SULKING			
DESTROYING OWN, OTHER'S, OR SCHOOL PROPERTY			
STEALING			
BLAMING OTHERS: NOT ASSUMING RESPONSIBILITY			
USING FOUL OR ABUSIVE LANGUAGE			
MAKING OBSCENE GESTURES			
THREATENING OTHER STUDENTS			
HITTING, FIGHTING WITH OTHER STUDENTS			
IGNORING TEACHER			
RESPONDING DISRESPECTFULLY TO TEACHER			
REFUSING TO COMPLY WITH TEACHER DEMANDS			
LYING TO TEACHER			
THREATENING, HITTING TEACHER			
	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL

_____
Observer

APPENDIX C

INTRODUCTORY SIGN-UP MEMORANDUM

TO NAUTILUS STAFF

November 1, 1976

MEMORANDUM

To: All Staff Members

From: Frank R. Petruzielo, Assistant Principal

RE: Coping with Disruptive Behavior in the Classroom

As you may know, improving student behavior is the Dade County School District's top priority for 1976-77. According to the Planning and Evaluation Department's June, 1976 study of disruptive behavior, junior high school teachers reported spending a considerably greater proportion of their time in coping with in-class disruptive behavior than elementary or senior high school teachers.

Indeed, thirty-five percent of the junior high teacher respondents reported spending nearly half of their time coping with disruptive behavior in their "worst" classes; twelve percent reported being struck by students; forty percent reported being threatened by a student with physical harm; and seventy-three percent reported having their instructional process completely disrupted.

It also seems important to note that seventy-five percent of the junior high teachers surveyed reported never having taken a course or orientation designed to assist them in coping with disruptive behavior. With this in mind, I have spent the past nine weeks researching strategies for dealing with disruptive students in the classroom and plan to conduct a series of brief seminars once a week (Wednesday or Thursday) during the next quin. These informal sessions will only last from 2:30 to 3:00 P.M. and should be helpful and informative for all.

Later in the quin, I have planned a group trip to the Youth Opportunity North alternative school facility. Hopefully, the members of their staff will also share with us successful strategies for dealing with disruptive students. If you are interested in participating in this orientation, please indicate below and return to me by Monday, November 8, 1976.

___ Yes, I am interested and can attend the session on Wednesday/Thursday. (Circle appropriate day)

___ No. I am not interested.

___ Maybe. I want more information. Please provide more details.

_____
Teacher's Name

APPENDIX D

CALENDAR OF IN-SERVICE SEMINARS

November 15, 1976

MEMORANDUM

To: All Participants

From: Frank Petruzielo, Assistant Principal

Subject: Calendar of Seminars on Coping with Disruptive Behavior

Twenty-nine (29) Nautilus Junior High School staff members have indicated a desire to participate in the planned seminars on coping with disruptive student behavior. A schedule of meetings and topics of discussion are indicated below.

Due to the large number of participants, I have decided to set up two seminar groups--one on Wednesdays and the other on Thursdays. Please note that meetings will begin this week for Group A on Wednesday, November 17th, and for Group B on Thursday, November 18th.

GROUP A (Wednesday)	GROUP B (Thursday)
Colman	Black
Delafe	Clark
Gottlieb	Dreyfuss
Infante	Greenhut
Jacobo	Hendel
Johnson	Hunt
McManus	Lassiter
Mindes	MacDonald
Reliford	Merkerson
Segor	Price
Shuster	Rose
Shusterman	Sawyer
Wilcox	Schwartz
Williams	Stock
Wright	

CALENDAR OF SEMINARS

	SEMINARS	Group A	Group B
I.	Pre-test on knowledge of skills and strategies for dealing with disruptive behavior.	Nov. 17, 1976	Nov. 18, 1976
II.	Overview: Dade County Survey; current methods for dealing with the problem; two articles to be distributed and read in advance: A. Ainsworth, L. and Stapleton, J. C. "Discipline at the Junior High School Level." B. Terrell, H. W. "School Discipline: A Cooperative Approach."	Dec. 1, 1976	Dec. 2, 1976
III.	"The Dirty Dozen: Roadblocks to Communication" ...Guest Speaker (Mr. J. Baggot) ...Prepared materials to be distributed and read in advance.	Dec. 8, 1976	Dec. 9, 1976
IV.	"Active listening: Key to Teacher Effectiveness" ...Guest speaker (Mr. J. Baggot) ...Prepared materials to be distributed and read in advance.	Dec. 15, 1976	Dec. 16, 1976
V.	"Behavior Modification: Can it Help?"...one article and notes from Clarizio's book on positive reinforcement: to be distributed and read in advance. A. George, P. S. "Good discipline through contingency management." B. Clarizio, Harvey Toward Postive Classroom Discipline	Jan. 5, 1977	Jan. 6, 1977

	SEMINARS	Group A	Group B
VI.	"Behavior Modification: Classroom Applications." ...Guest Speaker (Mr. A. Gottlieb) ...Prepared materials to be distributed and read in advance.	Jan. 12, 1977	Jan. 13, 1977
VII.	"Classroom Management: The use of logical consequences." ...Two articles to be distributed and read in advance. A. Dinkmeyer, D. and Dinkmeyer, Dr. Jr. "Logical consequences: A key to the reduction of disciplinary problems." B. Doyle, W. "Helping Beginning Teachers Manage Classrooms."	Jan. 19, 1977	Jan. 20, 1977
VIII.	"Punishment: Pros and Cons." ...One article and notes from Clarizio's book on rewards vs. punishment and Kounin's book on punishment vs. desists to be distributed and read in advance. A. Whiteside, M. "School Discipline: The Ongoing Crisis." B. Clarizio, Harvey, Toward Positive Classroom Discipline. C. Kounin, Jacob Discipline and Group Management in Classrooms.	Jan. 26 1977	Jan. 27, 1977
IX.	"Youth Opportunity North: An Alternative for the Disruptive Student." Special...Presentation by Y.O.N.'s Principal, Mr. A. Coverson, and selected staff.	Teacher Workday Jan. 28, 1977	
X.	Post-test on knowledge of skills and strategies for dealing with disruptive behavior.	Feb. 2, 1977	Feb. 3, 1977

APPENDIX E

LETTER TO DR. ARTHUR COVERSON, PRINCIPAL

OF YOUTH OPPORTUNITY NORTH

NAUTILUS JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

4301 N. MICHIGAN AVENUE

MIAMI BEACH, FLORIDA 33140

MARTIN D. KAVANAUGH
PRINCIPAL

DR. E. L. WHIGHAM
SUPT. DADE COUNTY SCHOOLS

MEMORANDUM

January 6, 1977

To: Dr. Arthur Coverson, Administrator
Youth Opportunity School North

From: Frank R. Petruzielo, Assistant Principal
Nautilus Junior High School

Subject: In-Service Presentation:
"Strategies for Dealing with Disruptive Students"

This is to confirm our telephone conversation last month during which you agreed to present, for interested members of our staff, a brief in-service program entitled: "Strategies for Dealing with Disruptive Students."

Your presentation is scheduled for 10:00 - 11:00 A.M. on Friday, January 28, 1977 (a teacher work day) in the Nautilus Junior High School library.

Again, thank you for your help and cooperation!

APPENDIX F

INDIVIDUAL CLASSROOM DISRUPTION FREQUENCY CHARTS FOR EACH PARTICIPANT

CLASSROOM DISRUPTION FREQUENCY CHART

Participant 1 / Teacher | English / Subject | Period

STUDENT MISBEHAVIOR	Date: PRE-TREATMENT FREQUENCY	Date: POST-TREATMENT FREQUENCY	DIFFERENCE
ARRIVING LATE	6	1	-5
FAILING TO BRING HOMEWORK	2	0	-2
FAILING TO BRING BOOKS, PAPER, ETC.	3	1	-2
TALKING WITHOUT PERMISSION	15	2	-13
NOT PAYING ATTENTION	13	2	-11
NOT WORKING ON ASSIGNMENTS	5	1	-4
SQUIRMING, FIDGETING	11	3	-8
GETTING OUT OF SEAT WITHOUT PERMISSION	2	0	-2
MAKING LOUD NOISE, LAUGHING	3	1	-2
INTERFERING WITH WORK OF OTHERS	2	0	-2
HINDERING GROUP ACTIVITIES	1	0	-1
SULKING	0	0	0
DESTROYING OWN, OTHER'S, OR SCHOOL PROPERTY	0	0	0
STEALING	0	0	0
BLAMING OTHERS: NOT ASSUMING RESPONSIBILITY	3	0	-3
USING FOUL OF ABUSIVE LANGUAGE	0	0	0
MAKING OBSCENE GESTURES	0	0	0
THREATENING OTHER STUDENTS	0	0	0
HITTING, FIGHTING WITH OTHER STUDENTS	4	0	0
IGNORING TEACHER	2	1	-3
RESPONDING DISRESPECTFULLY TO TEACHER	1	0	-2
REFUSING TO COMPLY WITH TEACHER DEMANDS	0	0	0
LYING TO TEACHER	0	0	0
THREATENING, HITTING TEACHER	0	0	0
	73 TOTAL	12 TOTAL	-61 TOTAL

Hal Blitman, Assistant Principal
Observer

CLASSROOM DISRUPTION FREQUENCY CHART

Participant 2 (Teacher) | Mathematics (Subject) | _____ (Period)

STUDENT MISBEHAVIOR	Date: PRE-TREATMENT FREQUENCY	Date: POST-TREATMENT FREQUENCY	DIFFERENCE
ARRIVING LATE	4	1	-3
FAILING TO BRING HOMEWORK	3	1	-2
FAILING TO BRING BOOKS, PAPER, ETC.	2	0	-2
TALKING WITHOUT PERMISSION	18	3	-15
NOT PAYING ATTENTION	11	3	-8
NOT WORKING ON ASSIGNMENTS	9	1	-8
SQUIRMING, FIDGETING	17	4	-13
GETTING OUT OF SEAT WITHOUT PERMISSION	4	0	-4
MAKING LOUD NOISE, LAUGHING	12	1	-11
INTERFERING WITH WORK OF OTHERS	2	0	-2
HINDERING GROUP ACTIVITIES	2	0	-2
SULKING	1	0	-1
DESTROYING OWN, OTHER'S, OR SCHOOL PROPERTY	0	0	0
STEALING	0	0	0
BLAMING OTHERS: NOT ASSUMING RESPONSIBILITY	4	1	-3
USING FOUL OF ABUSIVE LANGUAGE	0	0	0
MAKING OBSCENE GESTURES	0	0	0
THREATENING OTHER STUDENTS	0	0	0
HITTING, FIGHTING WITH OTHER STUDENTS	0	0	0
IGNORING TEACHER	6	1	-5
RESPONDING DISRESPECTFULLY TO TEACHER	2	0	-2
REFUSING TO COMPLY WITH TEACHER DEMANDS	1	0	-1
LYING TO TEACHER	0	0	0
THREATENING, HITTING TEACHER	0	0	0
	98 TOTAL	16 TOTAL	-82 TOTAL

Hal Blitman, Assistant Principal (Observer)

CLASSROOM DISRUPTION FREQUENCY CHART

Participant 3 (Teacher) | Mathematics (Subject) | _____ (Period)

STUDENT MISBEHAVIOR	Date: PRE-TREATMENT FREQUENCY	Date: POST-TREATMENT FREQUENCY	DIFFERENCE
ARRIVING LATE	4	2	-2
FAILING TO BRING HOMEWORK	6	2	-4
FAILING TO BRING BOOKS, PAPER, ETC.	6	3	-3
TALKING WITHOUT PERMISSION	19	6	-13
NOT PAYING ATTENTION	22	5	-17
NOT WORKING ON ASSIGNMENTS	11	4	-7
SQUIRMING, FIDGETING	17	6	-11
GETTING OUT OF SEAT WITHOUT PERMISSION	8	2	-6
MAKING LOUD NOISE, LAUGHING	10	7	-3
INTERFERING WITH WORK OF OTHERS	6	1	-5
HINDERING GROUP ACTIVITIES	4	1	-3
SULKING	0	1	+1
DESTROYING OWN, OTHER'S, OR SCHOOL PROPERTY	0	0	0
STEALING	0	0	0
BLAMING OTHERS: NOT ASSUMING RESPONSIBILITY	3	1	-2
USING FOUL OF ABUSIVE LANGUAGE	0	0	0
MAKING OBSCENE GESTURES	0	0	0
THREATENING OTHER STUDENTS	0	0	0
HITTING, FIGHTING WITH OTHER STUDENTS	0	0	0
IGNORING TEACHER	12	2	-10
RESPONDING DISRESPECTFULLY TO TEACHER	7	1	-6
REFUSING TO COMPLY WITH TEACHER DEMANDS	5	0	-5
LYING TO TEACHER	0	0	0
THREATENING, HITTING TEACHER	0	0	0
	~~140~~ TOTAL	~~44~~ TOTAL	~~-96~~ TOTAL

Hal Blitman, Assistant Principal (Observer)

CLASSROOM DISRUPTION FREQUENCY CHART

Participant 4 (Teacher) | Social Studies (Subject) | _____ (Period)

STUDENT MISBEHAVIOR	Date: PRE-TREATMENT FREQUENCY	Date: POST-TREATMENT FREQUENCY	DIFFERENCE
ARRIVING LATE	4	2	-2
FAILING TO BRING HOMEWORK	3	1	-2
FAILING TO BRING BOOKS, PAPER, ETC.	2	2	0
TALKING WITHOUT PERMISSION	12	4	-8
NOT PAYING ATTENTION	11	4	-7
NOT WORKING ON ASSIGNMENTS	8	2	-6
SQUIRMING, FIDGETING	10	3	-7
GETTING OUT OF SEAT WITHOUT PERMISSION	4	2	-2
MAKING LOUD NOISE, LAUGHING	6	2	-4
INTERFERING WITH WORK OF OTHERS	3	0	-3
HINDERING GROUP ACTIVITIES	1	0	-1
SULKING	0	1	+1
DESTROYING OWN, OTHER'S, OR SCHOOL PROPERTY	1	0	-1
STEALING	0	0	0
BLAMING OTHERS: NOT ASSUMING RESPONSIBILITY	1	0	-1
USING FOUL OF ABUSIVE LANGUAGE	0	0	0
MAKING OBSCENE GESTURES	0	0	0
THREATENING OTHER STUDENTS	0	0	0
HITTING, FIGHTING WITH OTHER STUDENTS	0	0	0
IGNORING TEACHER	3	1	-2
RESPONDING DISRESPECTFULLY TO TEACHER	1	0	-1
REFUSING TO COMPLY WITH TEACHER DEMANDS	1	0	-1
LYING TO TEACHER	0	0	0
THREATENING, HITTING TEACHER	0	0	0
	71 TOTAL	24 TOTAL	-47 TOTAL

Hal Blitman, Assistant Principal
Observer

CLASSROOM DISRUPTION FREQUENCY CHART

Participant 5 (Teacher) | Science (Subject) | (Period)

STUDENT MISBEHAVIOR	Date: PRE-TREATMENT FREQUENCY	Date: POST-TREATMENT FREQUENCY	DIFFERENCE
ARRIVING LATE	3	1	-2
FAILING TO BRING HOMEWORK	2	1	-1
FAILING TO BRING BOOKS, PAPER, ETC.	2	0	-2
TALKING WITHOUT PERMISSION	7	2	-5
NOT PAYING ATTENTION	3	1	-2
NOT WORKING ON ASSIGNMENTS	2	1	-1
SQUIRMING, FIDGETING	8	4	-4
GETTING OUT OF SEAT WITHOUT PERMISSION	2	0	-2
MAKING LOUD NOISE, LAUGHING	6	1	-5
INTERFERING WITH WORK OF OTHERS	1	0	-1
HINDERING GROUP ACTIVITIES	1	0	-1
SULKING	0	0	0
DESTROYING OWN, OTHER'S, OR SCHOOL PROPERTY	0	0	0
STEALING	0	0	0
BLAMING OTHERS: NOT ASSUMING RESPONSIBILITY	0	0	0
USING FOUL OF ABUSIVE LANGUAGE	0	0	0
MAKING OBSCENE GESTURES	0	0	0
THREATENING OTHER STUDENTS	0	0	0
HITTING, FIGHTING WITH OTHER STUDENTS	0	0	0
IGNORING TEACHER	2	1	-1
RESPONDING DISRESPECTFULLY TO TEACHER	0	0	0
REFUSING TO COMPLY WITH TEACHER DEMANDS	0	0	0
LYING TO TEACHER	0	0	0
THREATENING, HITTING TEACHER	0	0	0
	39 TOTAL	12 TOTAL	-27 TOTAL

Hal Blitman, Assistant Principal (Observer)

CLASSROOM DISRUPTION FREQUENCY CHART

Participant 6 (Teacher) | Art (Subject) | _____ (Period)

STUDENT MISBEHAVIOR	Date: PRE-TREATMENT FREQUENCY	Date: POST-TREATMENT FREQUENCY	DIFFERENCE
ARRIVING LATE	3	1	-2
FAILING TO BRING HOMEWORK	1	0	-1
FAILING TO BRING BOOKS, PAPER, ETC.	2	0	-2
TALKING WITHOUT PERMISSION	10	3	-7
NOT PAYING ATTENTION	6	2	-4
NOT WORKING ON ASSIGNMENTS	3	1	-2
SQUIRMING, FIDGETING	7	2	-5
GETTING OUT OF SEAT WITHOUT PERMISSION	2	0	-2
MAKING LOUD NOISE, LAUGHING	8	2	-6
INTERFERING WITH WORK OF OTHERS	3	0	-3
HINDERING GROUP ACTIVITIES	1	0	-1
SULKING	1	0	-1
DESTROYING OWN, OTHER'S, OR SCHOOL PROPERTY	0	0	0
STEALING	0	0	0
BLAMING OTHERS: NOT ASSUMING RESPONSIBILITY	2	0	-2
USING FOUL OF ABUSIVE LANGUAGE	0	0	0
MAKING OBSCENE GESTURES	0	0	0
THREATENING OTHER STUDENTS	0	0	0
HITTING, FIGHTING WITH OTHER STUDENTS	0	0	0
IGNORING TEACHER	2	1	-1
RESPONDING DISRESPECTFULLY TO TEACHER	1	0	-1
REFUSING TO COMPLY WITH TEACHER DEMANDS	1	0	-1
LYING TO TEACHER	0	0	0
THREATENING, HITTING TEACHER	0	0	0
	53 TOTAL	12 TOTAL	-41 TOTAL

Hal Blitman, Assistant Principal
Observer

CLASSROOM DISRUPTION FREQUENCY CHART

Participant 7 (Teacher) | Science (Subject) | (Period)

STUDENT MISBEHAVIOR	Date: PRE-TREATMENT FREQUENCY	Date: POST-TREATMENT FREQUENCY	DIFFERENCE
ARRIVING LATE	4	2	-2
FAILING TO BRING HOMEWORK	2	1	-1
FAILING TO BRING BOOKS, PAPER, ETC.	2	1	-1
TALKING WITHOUT PERMISSION	12	4	-8
NOT PAYING ATTENTION	8	3	-5
NOT WORKING ON ASSIGNMENTS	6	3	-3
SQUIRMING, FIDGETING	13	4	-9
GETTING OUT OF SEAT WITHOUT PERMISSION	4	0	-4
MAKING LOUD NOISE, LAUGHING	7	2	-5
INTERFERING WITH WORK OF OTHERS	3	0	-3
HINDERING GROUP ACTIVITIES	2	0	-2
SULKING	0	0	0
DESTROYING OWN, OTHER'S, OR SCHOOL PROPERTY	0	0	0
STEALING	0	0	0
BLAMING OTHERS: NOT ASSUMING RESPONSIBILITY	4	1	-3
USING FOUL OF ABUSIVE LANGUAGE	0	0	0
MAKING OBSCENE GESTURES	0	0	0
THREATENING OTHER STUDENTS	0	0	0
HITTING, FIGHTING WITH OTHER STUDENTS	0	0	0
IGNORING TEACHER	5	1	-4
RESPONDING DISRESPECTFULLY TO TEACHER	1	0	-1
REFUSING TO COMPLY WITH TEACHER DEMANDS	3	0	-3
LYING TO TEACHER	0	0	0
THREATENING, HITTING TEACHER	0	0	0
	76 TOTAL	22 TOTAL	-54 TOTAL

Hal Blitman, Assistant Principal
Observer

CLASSROOM DISRUPTION FREQUENCY CHART

Participant 8 (Teacher) | Social Studies (Subject) | _____ (Period)

STUDENT MISBEHAVIOR	Date: PRE-TREATMENT FREQUENCY	Date: POST-TREATMENT FREQUENCY	DIFFERENCE
ARRIVING LATE	5	1	-3
FAILING TO BRING HOMEWORK	4	2	-2
FAILING TO BRING BOOKS, PAPER, ETC.	4	1	-3
TALKING WITHOUT PERMISSION	8	3	-5
NOT PAYING ATTENTION	6	2	-4
NOT WORKING ON ASSIGNMENTS	5	1	-4
SQUIRMING, FIDGETING	11	3	-8
GETTING OUT OF SEAT WITHOUT PERMISSION	3	1	-2
MAKING LOUD NOISE, LAUGHING	7	3	-4
INTERFERING WITH WORK OF OTHERS	3	1	-2
HINDERING GROUP ACTIVITIES	1	0	-1
SULKING	1	0	-1
DESTROYING OWN, OTHER'S, OR SCHOOL PROPERTY	0	0	0
STEALING	0	0	0
BLAMING OTHERS: NOT ASSUMING RESPONSIBILITY	2	1	-1
USING FOUL OF ABUSIVE LANGUAGE	0	0	0
MAKING OBSCENE GESTURES	0	0	0
THREATENING OTHER STUDENTS	0	0	0
HITTING, FIGHTING WITH OTHER STUDENTS	0	0	0
IGNORING TEACHER	3	1	-2
RESPONDING DISRESPECTFULLY TO TEACHER	2	0	-2
REFUSING TO COMPLY WITH TEACHER DEMANDS	4	0	-4
LYING TO TEACHER	0	0	0
THREATENING, HITTING TEACHER	0	0	0
	69 TOTAL	21 TOTAL	-48 TOTAL

Hal Blitman, Assistant Principal (Observer)

CLASSROOM DISRUPTION FREQUENCY CHART

Participant 9 (Teacher) | English (Subject) | (Period)

STUDENT MISBEHAVIOR	Date: PRE-TREATMENT FREQUENCY	Date: POST-TREATMENT FREQUENCY	DIFFERENCE
ARRIVING LATE	4	2	-2
FAILING TO BRING HOMEWORK	3	2	-1
FAILING TO BRING BOOKS, PAPER, ETC.	3	1	-2
TALKING WITHOUT PERMISSION	22	10	-12
NOT PAYING ATTENTION	18	8	-10
NOT WORKING ON ASSIGNMENTS	13	4	-9
SQUIRMING, FIDGETING	14	6	-8
GETTING OUT OF SEAT WITHOUT PERMISSION	6	2	-4
MAKING LOUD NOISE, LAUGHING	12	3	-9
INTERFERING WITH WORK OF OTHERS	5	1	-4
HINDERING GROUP ACTIVITIES	4	1	-3
SULKING	2	1	-1
DESTROYING OWN, OTHER'S, OR SCHOOL PROPERTY	1	0	-1
STEALING	0	0	0
BLAMING OTHERS: NOT ASSUMING RESPONSIBILITY	6	2	-4
USING FOUL OF ABUSIVE LANGUAGE	0	0	0
MAKING OBSCENE GESTURES	0	0	0
THREATENING OTHER STUDENTS	0	0	0
HITTING, FIGHTING WITH OTHER STUDENTS	0	0	0
IGNORING TEACHER	7	1	-6
RESPONDING DISRESPECTFULLY TO TEACHER	3	1	-2
REFUSING TO COMPLY WITH TEACHER DEMANDS	5	2	-3
LYING TO TEACHER	0	0	0
THREATENING, HITTING TEACHER	0	0	0
	128 TOTAL	47 TOTAL	-81 TOTAL

Hal Blitman, Assistant Principal
Observer

CLASSROOM DISRUPTION FREQUENCY CHART

Participant 10 (Teacher) | Music (Subject) | (Period)

STUDENT MISBEHAVIOR	Date: PRE-TREATMENT FREQUENCY	Date: POST-TREATMENT FREQUENCY	DIFFERENCE
ARRIVING LATE	4	2	-2
FAILING TO BRING HOMEWORK	2	1	-1
FAILING TO BRING BOOKS, PAPER, ETC.	2	1	-1
TALKING WITHOUT PERMISSION	8	3	-5
NOT PAYING ATTENTION	3	1	-2
NOT WORKING ON ASSIGNMENTS	3	1	-2
SQUIRMING, FIDGETING	6	2	-4
GETTING OUT OF SEAT WITHOUT PERMISSION	1	0	-1
MAKING LOUD NOISE, LAUGHING	4	2	-2
INTERFERING WITH WORK OF OTHERS	1	0	-2
HINDERING GROUP ACTIVITIES	2	0	-2
SULKING	0	0	0
DESTROYING OWN, OTHER'S, OR SCHOOL PROPERTY	0	0	0
STEALING	0	0	0
BLAMING OTHERS: NOT ASSUMING RESPONSIBILITY	0	0	0
USING FOUL OF ABUSIVE LANGUAGE	0	0	0
MAKING OBSCENE GESTURES	0	0	0
THREATENING OTHER STUDENTS	0	0	0
HITTING, FIGHTING WITH OTHER STUDENTS	0	0	0
IGNORING TEACHER	2	1	-1
RESPONDING DISRESPECTFULLY TO TEACHER	1	0	-1
REFUSING TO COMPLY WITH TEACHER DEMANDS	1	0	-1
LYING TO TEACHER	0	0	0
THREATENING, HITTING TEACHER	0	0	0
	40 TOTAL	14 TOTAL	126 TOTAL

Hal Blitman, Assistant Principal — Observer

CLASSROOM DISRUPTION FREQUENCY CHART

Participant 11 (Teacher) | Typing (Subject) | (Period)

STUDENT MISBEHAVIOR	Date: PRE-TREATMENT FREQUENCY	Date: POST-TREATMENT FREQUENCY	DIFFERENCE
ARRIVING LATE	2	1	-1
FAILING TO BRING HOMEWORK	2	1	-1
FAILING TO BRING BOOKS, PAPER, ETC.	1	0	-1
TALKING WITHOUT PERMISSION	8	3	-5
NOT PAYING ATTENTION	4	1	-3
NOT WORKING ON ASSIGNMENTS	2	1	-1
SQUIRMING, FIDGETING	9	3	-6
GETTING OUT OF SEAT WITHOUT PERMISSION	2	0	-2
MAKING LOUD NOISE, LAUGHING	7	2	-5
INTERFERING WITH WORK OF OTHERS	3	1	-2
HINDERING GROUP ACTIVITIES	1	0	-1
SULKING	1	0	-1
DESTROYING OWN, OTHER'S, OR SCHOOL PROPERTY	1	0	-1
STEALING	0	0	0
BLAMING OTHERS: NOT ASSUMING RESPONSIBILITY	3	1	-2
USING FOUL OF ABUSIVE LANGUAGE	0	0	0
MAKING OBSCENE GESTURES	0	0	0
THREATENING OTHER STUDENTS	0	0	0
HITTING, FIGHTING WITH OTHER STUDENTS	0	0	0
IGNORING TEACHER	0	0	0
RESPONDING DISRESPECTFULLY TO TEACHER	1	0	-0
REFUSING TO COMPLY WITH TEACHER DEMANDS	2	0	-2
LYING TO TEACHER	0	0	0
THREATENING, HITTING TEACHER	0	0	0
	49 TOTAL	14 TOTAL	-35 TOTAL

Hal Blitman, Assistant Principal
Observer